

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the remarks and amendments following is respectfully requested. Claims 1-18 are in this case. Claims 1-18 have been rejected. Claims 7 and 12 have been canceled without prejudice. New claim 19 has been added. Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 13-14 have been amended.

***DRAWINGS***

The Examiner objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p), and stated that appropriate corrections are required. Please find enclosed herewith corrected Figure 1.

**35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections – Pollack**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 8, 11-15 and 17 over USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Pollack (US Patent No. 6,505,236). The rejections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed.

Pollack teaches a network based system for storing attachments of e-mail messages, and a method for storing such attachments. Attachments are stripped from received e-mail messages, and are stored on a network, such that they can later be accessed by the recipient of the e-mail message. The recipient of the message is notified of the location in which the attachment is stored by the appending to the sent e-mail message a handle connected to the attachment.

Pollack additionally concerns himself with other features of storing attachment files, such as determining whether a user should be charged a fee for use of the storage system, calculation of the time after which stored attachments should be deleted, deleting the attachments when the calculated time passes, comparing a recently received attachment with previously stored attachments in order to determine if the attachments are identical and reduce the redundant use of storage space in the system and resetting the handles of files that have been deleted. Indeed, Pollack focuses on the storage aspects of e-mail attachments and handling of such attachments.

The object of the present invention is to provide a method and system for rapid downloading of e-mail messages containing encoded attachments by a user, by use of an e-mail proxy. Such rapid transmission and downloading of e-mail messages containing attachments is obtained by downloading only the information about the attachments, linking the information to a formatted e-mail message which does not contain the attachment, and downloading the attachment from the e-mail server to the proxy upon request or in the background. The attachment is then decoded by the proxy, and is sent to the user upon request, when the user presses the link appended to the e-mail message that was sent.

The present invention is not concerned with storing a message in any type of disk or on a network, as it is instead concerned with the speed of delivery of the message, and with the amount of bandwidth used, as opposed to the teachings of Pollack. In the present invention, attachments are downloaded

from the email server, and from the e-mail proxy in a streamed manner, after being decoded, such that less data is downloaded and each received portion of the attachment can be viewed immediately without waiting for the whole attachment to be downloaded.

Moreover, Pollack does not teach decoding of attachments, as Pollack is not concerned with the size of the attachment or with the amount of bandwidth required in order to transmit such an attachment. According to the teachings of Pollack, a message may be stored in the system in an encoded manner. Therefore, each of the different recipients downloading the attachment would have to decode the attachment separately. By this method, the computational force saved by storing the attachment only a single time in the network storage space will be lost by the performance of extensive decoding actions by the client. This is of course if the client side has the correct software in order to decode the received attachments.

In the rejection of claims 1, 8, 14 and 15 the Examiner states that the claimed subject matter is taught by Pollack, as Pollack teaches that the handle generator receives the file name and location, which is interpreted by the Examiner as the attachment information, as is seen in column 5 lines 17-19 of Pollack. In the lines referenced by the Examiner Pollack teaches that after the attachments are downloaded into the storage system, a file handle is generated using the file name and location: "Handle generator 42 generates a handle 44 that corresponds to the filename 38 and address 40 of the stored attachment 20' stored on storage device 26".

By contrast, the present invention teaches optionally retrieving the attachment information before the attachment itself is downloaded from the e-mail server to the proxy. This is clear from page 10 lines 7-9 “optionally only the header information for the attachments is downloaded, while the attachments themselves are downloaded at a later point (for example, in the background”.

In order to further differentiate the present invention from that of Pollack, claims 1-6, 8-11 and 13-14 have been amended. A further limitation of the attachments being encoded was added to the independent claims. The dependent claims were amended accordingly.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections – Pollack in view of Pizano**

The Examiner rejected claims 7 and 10 over USC 103(a) as being anticipated by Pollack in view of Pizano (US patent No. 6,105,055).

The object of Pollack is given above.

The object of Pizano is to provide a multimedia collaboration system, which combines unique multimedia communications and media processing mechanisms, with components that support information sharing and distribution. The system includes a delayed conference manager connected to a conference database, for archiving, maintaining and managing the information shared and the information related to each of the participating users of the system.

The Examiner states that Pizano teaches downloading e-mail messages and decoding any attachments before transmitting the message or attachment to the user, making reference to column 4, lines 46-47 of Pizano.

In the reference specified by the Examiner, Pizano teaches the decoding of messages or attachment in order to store them in the system database: "DC manager 18 will download the email from the email server 16, decode the annotation attachment, and put the attachment into the designated entry/folder at a conference database 24". Therefore, the decoding mechanism taught by Pizano is directed at a better storage mechanism, as is Pollack.

However, the decoding taught by the present invention is used for reducing transmission time and bandwidth used, such that a recipient receiving an attachment will receive it in a decoded format, and such that the attachment can be sent and viewed in a streamed manner as it is already decoded.

Combining the decoding taught by Pizano with the system taught by Pollack would not result in the teachings of the present invention, as both the methods are geared towards storage of data. Decoding data according to the method of Pizano before sending it in the system taught by Pollack would not help in accelerating the transmission rate, or in saving bandwidth, as Pizano further teaches "newly arrived post will not be accessible at the DC manager 18 until the downloading and storing process is completely finished" (column 4, lines 52-54). Therefore, the combination of the two systems would not enable sending data in a streamed manner, and would not result in saving bandwidth or transferring time.

In the rejection of claim 10, the Examiner states that according to the teachings of Pollack “decoding occurs once user requests attachment”.

However, this would result in the attachment being decoded multiple times if requested by multiple users, or by the same user more than once, thus resulting in redundant calculation and time waste.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections – Pollack in view of Dowling**

The Examiner rejected claim 9 over USC 103(a) as being anticipated by Pollack in view of Dowling (US Patent No. 6,574,239).

The object of Pollack is given above.

The object of Dowling is to provide a method for reconnecting a telephone modem with a reduced delay by reducing a time associated with retraining. This is achieved by saving a set of connection parameters which are retrieved when the modem is reconnected. Another method for reconnecting a telephone modem taught by Dowling is related to changes to the physical layers of the server.

The Examiner states that Dowling teaches background downloading of data that will not be used until later, while other processes are occurring.

Applicant traverses these statements as follows. In the lines quoted by the Examiner Dowling teaches that the prediction according to which “background downloading” occurs is learned by observing the workflow habits of a user.

However, in the teachings of the present invention the background

downloading of attachments is performed regardless of the user habits, as the user is not required to be aware of such downloading.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections – Pollack in view of Slotznick**

The Examiner rejected claims 16 over USC 103(a) as being anticipated by Pollack in view of Slotznick (US patent No. 6,011,537).

The object of Pollack is given above.

The object of Slotznick is to provide a system for displaying information at a display of a local user computer, such that the information includes primary information requested by a user, and secondary information including additional information not directly requested by the user.

The Examiner states that Slotznick discloses downloading primary and secondary information containing information about a file before downloading the actual full file. However, Slotznick teaches in the location referenced by the Examiner, column 26 lines 62-67 and column 27 lines 1-5, that primary information is downloaded prior to downloading secondary information, together with a 4K portion of the secondary information file, subsequently to which the rest of the secondary information file is downloaded.

It is clear that a user would be motivated to download the primary information, which was directly requested, before downloading secondary information. However, the primary information downloaded is not information regarding the secondary information file to be subsequently downloaded. Additionally, the 4K portion of the secondary information file that is

downloaded is used to form a thumbnail or keyhole image of the secondary information. However, a keyhole image does not necessarily provide all the "metadata" type information which may be provided in an attachment header, such as the file size, location etc.

In view of the above remarks and amendments it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-19 are now in condition for allowance. Prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



---

D'vorah Graeser  
Agent for Applicant  
Registration No. 40,000

Date: January 19, 2004





ANNOTATED MARKED-UP DRAWING

Figure 1

